

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 18 April 2006. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 6 and 10 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and/or the dependency thereof and/or clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the Subject Patent Application. Claims 3 and 5 have been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 10 due to an informality therein. The Examiner kindly pointed out a perceived grammatical error with respect to the addition of a comma. While the undersigned attorney disagrees with the need for the comma indicated by the Examiner, Claim 10 has been amended to change the language thereof which is believed to clarify the claim and obviates any dispute over an added comma.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Kim et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,154, in view of Lu, U.S. Patent No. 6,225,981. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Kim et al. and Lu, and further in view of Sasselli et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,411,281, Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Kim et al. and Lu, and further in view of Hou, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0158837, and Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over Kim et al., Lu, and Hou, and further in view

of Farag et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,844,872. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 5-9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 3 and 5 therein. Thus, Claim 5 has effectively been placed in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1, and the only intervening claim, Claim 3. Thus, Claim 1 and the claims dependant thereon should now be allowable.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *10 July 2006*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586